surface of the adhesive contacts the first side of the liner. Moreover, the adhesive article of the present invention has been exposed to e-beam radiation through the second side of the liner and the article is rolled up with the second side of the liner in contact with the first surface of the adhesive. The second side of the liner and the first surface of the adhesive have a release value that is less than the release value of the first side of the liner adhered to the second surface of the adhesive (see, e.g., claim 1).

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 16-33, 54, 55 & 58-66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Collins (US 5,847,649) in view of Shaw (US 5,945,174). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Collins provides an adhesive article in role form wherein the article includes a release liner having differential release values on each side thereof (column 3, lines 3-7). The adhesive article described by Collins is an EAS (Electronic Article Surveillance) system for controlling the unauthorized taking of books from libraries and book stores (see column 1, lines 12-33). The articles described in Collins include a plurality of markers on a release liner. In one embodiment, the marker assembly includes a first adhesive layer on the first side of the markers, a second adhesive layer on the second side of the markers and a differential release liner having an easy release side and a tight release side positioned so that the tight release side is in contact with the second adhesive layer (column 1, lines 36-44). In another embodiment, the marker assembly includes an adhesive layer on only one side of the markers. The marker assembly can be formed into a roll or the marker assembly can be cut into sheets and placed on top of each other to form a stack of sheets (column 1, lines 44-49). Unlike the present invention, Collins neither discloses nor suggests exposing the adhesive article to e-beam radiation through the second side of the liner to crosslink adhesive disposed on the first side of the liner.

Shaw does not make up for the deficiencies of the Collins reference. Shaw discloses a release-coated liner having a silicon or fluorinated acrylate monomer evaporated and then condensed on a moving web and thereafter crosslinked by exposure to e-beam radiation or the like (see column 1, line 47-54). However, nothing within the Shaw reference teaches or suggests

exposing an adhesive article to e-beam radiation through the liner to crosslink the adhesive disposed on the opposite side thereof.

For at least the foregoing reasons applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 (a) rejection.

Applicant acknowledges the additional statement in the office action that claims 10-15 are free of the prior art. Accordingly, applicant assumes that these are allowable in their present form.

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the issues raised in the recent office action. It is believed that the present application and the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and the allowance of the application is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney if he believes that a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of the application.

Very truly yours

Oct. 8, 2002
Date

By: Daniel R. Pastirik
Daniel R. Pastirik, Reg. No.: 33,025
Telephone No.: 651-737-2685

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
P.O. Box 33427
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833